



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

DR. GINSBURG'S EDITION OF THE HEBREW BIBLE.

DR. CHRISTIAN D. GINSBURG has, for the last thirty years, devoted all his indefatigable energies to the study of the Massora and the Hebrew text of the Bible. After a critical study of Rabbi Jacob ben Chajim's Introduction to his Rabbinical Bible, and Elias Levita's Massora¹, he proceeded to the collection and explanation of all the available Massoretic material². Dr. Ginsburg has now produced as the ripe fruit of all his labours a critical Massoretic edition of Holy Writ³, the scope and plan of

¹ Jacob ben Chajim Ibn Adonijah's *Introduction to the Rabbinic Bible*, Hebrew and English; with Explanatory Notes, second edition, 1867. *The Massoreth Ha-Massoreth* of Elias Levita, being an exposition of the Massoretic Notes on the Hebrew Bible, or the Ancient Critical Apparatus of the Old Testament. In Hebrew, with an English Translation and Critical and Explanatory Notes, 1867.

² *The Massora*. Compiled from MSS., alphabetically and lexically arranged. 4 vols., imperial folio, 1880–1897 (vol. IV in the press). In the "Massoretic Studies" which I contributed to this REVIEW, 1896 and 1897, I discussed, as occasion served, several points of this work. I reserve a full discussion till after the appearance of the fourth volume. The criticism is still called for, notwithstanding Baer's Notice (*Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, XL, pp. 743–758). Baer does not even mention the main defect:—the omission of the sources of these Massoretic Notes. He furthermore censures Ginsburg's scrupulous fidelity to his text, the mistakes and contradictions of which are left uncorrected. This, in my opinion, is rather a merit, for the Massora can only be studied with success if the sources are edited in their original form. Critical science has no hankering for a Massoretic code, from which textual criticism would derive little profit, as the material for study would not be the original Massora, but its revision.

עתים ורבעה ספרי הקורש מוריים היוב על פי המסורה ועל פי סופרים ואשכנזים עם חלופים והגהות מן כתבי יד טריקים וחוגנומיים ישנים מאות דוד גינצבורג. חלק ראשון, בראשית—מלכים חלק שני שעה—דנרי הימים

which he has described in a voluminous work of 1028 pages, which appeared in London in 1897, under the title of *Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible*. As all questions relating to the new edition are exhaustively discussed in this Introduction, and even more material is submitted than is necessary in a preface, an analysis of this Introduction is naturally at the same time an appreciation of the entire edition. I do not wish this study to be regarded as a notice of the new edition of the Hebrew Bible. I confess that I have not yet specially studied this work, which on its first appearance did not, whether justly or otherwise, attract particular attention, and for the adequate examination of which there has indeed not yet been enough time. A satisfactory appreciation of the work, whose importance, from whichever side we regard it, is undeniable, can only be possible after close and protracted study; and the final verdict of Biblical science on the new notes to the old Text should not be hurried. Dr. Ginsburg tells us that he has followed Jacob ben Chajim's Text. In his Introduction he expresses with commendable clearness and brevity the differences between his and other editions as follows:—

“*The Text.*”

1. The Text itself is based upon that of the *first* edition of Jacob ben Chajim's *Massoretic Recension*, printed by Bomberg, at Venice, in the year 1524–1525. Existing Hebrew Bibles, which profess to follow Jacob ben Chajim's Text, have admitted in the course of years many unwarranted variations from it and many errors.

2. No variations, however strongly supported by Hebrew MSS. and Ancient Versions, are introduced in the Text itself, which has been compiled strictly in accordance with the Massora collected from the MSS.

title of the edition I will discuss in the *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft d. Judenthums*.

3. All variations are relegated entirely to the margin.
4. While the modern divisions of chapters and verses are noted for the sake of convenience, the Text is arranged according to the ancient chapters and sectional divisions of the Massora and the MSS., which are thus restored.
5. It uniformly reproduces the *Dageshèd* and *Raphèd* letters, which are found in all the best Massoretic MSS., but which have been omitted in all the current printed editions of the Hebrew Bible.
6. The ancient Massoretic chapters, called *Sedarim*, are also indicated throughout in the margin against their respective places.

The Margin.

7. *Kethiv* remains unpointed in the Text, but in the margin the words are punctuated twice according to the *Kethib* and according to the *Keri*, so that the differences cannot escape notice. (I have shortened this paragraph.)

8. The margin contains the various readings of the different standard codices which are quoted in the *Massora itself*, but which have long since perished.

9. It gives the various readings found in the MSS. and Ancient Versions.

10. It gives the readings of the Eastern and Western Schools against those words which are affected by them, lists of which are preserved, and given in the Model Codices and in certain special MSS.

11. It also gives against the affected words the variations between Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali, hitherto not indicated in the margin. These had been consigned to the end of the large editions of the Bible which contain the Massora of Jacob ben Chajim.

12. It gives, in some instances, readings of the Ancient Versions which are not supported by MS. authority.

13. It gives, for the first time, the class of various readings called *Sevirin* against every word affected by them. These *Sevirin* in many MSS. are given as the substantive textual

reading, or as of equal importance with the official Keri. These readings have been collected from numerous MSS."

Dr. Ginsburg followed the text of Jacob ben Chajim in his notes, which in reality form the kernel of his work. He works independently of other editors of the sacred text, relying upon a considerable number of early MSS. and editions which were printed when the Press was in its infancy. Using only those sixty Bible codices and twenty-four editions described by him, he was equipped with a better critical apparatus than his predecessors, Jacob ben Chajim, Elias Levita in his *Massoreth Ha-Massoreth*, Menachem di Lonzano in *Or Tórah*, Salomo of Norzi in *Minchath Shai*. The last two seem, by the way, to have been quite neglected by Dr. Ginsburg. Only with the views of Baer, his old and now deceased rival, does he in the notes to his Bible and in his Introduction tacitly and explicitly endeavour to harmonize his conclusions. This is, however, only the case with the notes to the last two parts of the edition, but not in the Pentateuch; and hence a revision of the notes on the five Books of Moses is promised, in order to give the entire work uniformity and consistency. One must, perforce, be content with this procedure, as well as with the whole plan of the work sketched by the editor down to the Variae Lectiones of the Ancient Versions.

Many will disagree with our author in the points to be mentioned. Not even those who in principle are agreed with Dr. Ginsburg on his use, for purposes of textual criticisms, of the ancient translation, but would feel some scruples about such thoroughgoing recourse to them, bearing in mind the present state of the Septuagint, Peschitta, and Targums.

The absence of a critical edition of these versions, and the obscurity in which the method followed by translators is still wrapped, can hardly justify the deduction of variations in the original text from variations in the translation. Isolated instances do not justify the assumption of a different text, till the character of the translation of a Biblical text

has been determined by careful induction, according to the methods adopted by Wellhausen and Driver in their study of the LXX on the Book of Samuel, and by Baumgärtner in his *Études critiques sur l'état du texte du Livre des Proverbes*, which comprise a study of the LXX and Targum on that book. Besides, Dr. Ginsburg does not proceed systematically. He himself states (p. 180) that he had not yet finished the re-translation of the Greek Bible into Hebrew.

The editor also adopts conjectural variations suggested by the textual critics; and on the strength of these two methods this edition of the Hebrew Bible is characterized as a critical as well as a Massoretic text.

I am, however, of the opinion that Dr. Ginsburg has here attempted the solution of two problems, each of which, by itself, is justified, while both are mutually exclusive and cannot therefore be solved simultaneously.

A Massoretic edition of the Bible can only give the Massoretic, i. e. the traditional, text, while a critical edition aims at the restoration of the original and its substitution for the traditional text. The Massora is the lower criticism, conjectural emendation belongs to the higher criticism. Even, however, if we discarded the points of opposition between these two tendencies we cannot approve of Dr. Ginsburg's procedure, because his "conjectural" criticism is extremely defective, one might even say accidental and arbitrary. Besides, the interpolation of these suggested "emendations" disturbs the survey of an integral tradition.

It would therefore have enhanced the value of this new edition if its editor had confined himself to the presentation of the Massoretic text, leaving other criticisms to *Haupt's Rainbow Bible* and similar works, like Grätz's *Emendationes in plerosque Sacrae Scripturae V. T. Libros*, &c.

Before going into details I will add one more remark of a general nature. Neither the Hebrew Bible nor the Introduction is intended for the beginner.

One might fairly expect that all the scientific work

already accomplished in this field should have been utilized. This has not been done, though the Introduction runs to 1028 pages. Dr. Ginsburg's Introduction, which deals only with a fragment of Biblical Isagogies, viz. the History of the Text, omitting the Ancient Versions, surpasses in compass all modern introductions, but is behind them in its scanty incorporation of Modern Literature. The whole work is characterized by an amplitude which occasionally becomes wearisome.

2.

The Introduction falls into two parts. The first part discusses in eight chapters the external form of the Biblical Text (pp. 1-113), the second, in thirteen chapters (pp. 114-976), deals with the text itself.

The last two chapters, which contain a history of MSS. till the year 1513, and of ancient printed editions till the year 1528, may be regarded as an independent third part. This is followed by interesting appendices, detailed indices, and tables (pp. 977-1028). The history of the external division of the text is rightly treated in line of descent and not in chronological order, which would have rendered review more difficult and could not have been fixed with certainty.

In the first chapter (pp. 1-8) the order of the several books is discussed. The oldest account is contained in the famous Boraitha *T. B. Baba Bathra*, 14 b, which, however, omits the Pentateuch. The second citation from the Boraitha, which names the authors of the Biblical books, beginning with Moses the writer of the Thora, shows, however, that the Boraithas must have originally also contained the order of the five Books of Moses, though this is omitted in extant editions. This has already been noticed by Krochmal, *Kerem Chemed*, V, 57.

Dr. Ginsburg is therefore incorrect when he says (p. 1) of this Boraitha: "Passing over the *Pentateuch*, about which there never has been any doubt." The five Megilloth which,

like the Pentateuch, are used in the Liturgy are on this account in MSS., as they are also in the most ancient printed editions (and even in *Norzi*), often incorporated with the Pentateuch. The order in these MSS. and editions is the same as that in which they are read at the festivals. Dr. Ginsburg, without even mentioning this notorious fact, arranges in tabular form four different orders of the five scrolls. It is obvious that I and V, which are identical, are arranged according to the ritual; III is chronological; II follows the ritual but begins with Purim; IV is chronological, but Koheleth is placed after instead of before Lamentations.

In reality, therefore, there are only two classifications, the ancient, according to chronology, and the modern, which follows the liturgy and is given in the appendix to the Pentateuch. The order of the early prophets exhibits no deviations. The later prophets, however, are found in three different classifications (p. 6).

The largest number of variations are found in the order of the Hagiographa. A table on page 7 gives no less than eight different arrangements. Careful examination, however, will reduce these to three. The differences between I, II, III, VII, VIII, are very slight: these can, therefore, be considered as practically identical; IV and V are also similar; VI is unique. Dr. Ginsburg is therefore right in accepting the traditional order, which is supported by most of the MSS.

In chapters ii-v Dr. Ginsburg treats of the open and closed Parshioth, the division into chapters which we owe to the Vulgate, the Sedras of the Palestinian triennial cycles, and the Parshioth of the Babylonian annual cycle (pp. 9-67).

As I intend shortly to publish an essay on this subject, to which I have devoted some considerable time, I will not on this occasion enter into detailed criticisms. The wealth of material which Dr. Ginsburg gathered from MSS. is most clearly set forth, and Baer, who had occupied himself with

this branch of the Massora for several decades¹, is corrected in several particulars.

I do not understand why Dr. Ginsburg treats of the division into chapters before the much earlier divisions into Sedras.

Limited space prevents discussion of the three following chapters on the verse-division, number of words and letters (pp. 68–113).

My "Massoretic Studies," which appeared in this REVIEW (1896–1897), deal with these topics; and an essay which will appear in this REVIEW will discuss Dr. Ginsburg's method.

We now proceed to the second part of the work under notice.

3.

In the chapter "Dagesh and Raphè" (pp. 114–136) the rule about the placing of the Raphè line over נָגָדָכָה and other quiescent letters (פְּרַחֲצָוֹר, וְיִאֲמָר) is first clearly and decisively established. Dr. Ginsburg convincingly disproves Baer-Delitzsch's dictum that a Dagesh should be used:—

1. In every word beginning with the same consonant as that with which the previous word terminated, לְאַכֵּל פָּחָם בְּכָל לְבִי (Gen. xxxi. 54), (Ps. ix. 2), &c.

2. In every consonant after a guttural with quiescent sheva, e. g. לְעֵדָה (Gen. x. 7), מִחְפָּה (Ps. xlvi. 2).

"Hence Delitzsch's statement that the Dagesh in a consonant after a guttural with Sheva is to be found in all the best MSS. is based upon wrong data, for which, as the article in question shows, Dr. Baer is responsible.

"To introduce, therefore, this eccentric Dagesh throughout the Hebrew Bible, as has been done by Dr. Baer, is a most unjustifiable innovation. The only thing which can legitimately be done with the evidence of the MSS. and early

¹ Baer wrote already in the year 1851: Our first aim in our work on the Massora was to arrange, elucidate and, where necessary, annotate the scattered statements concerning the number of Letters, Words, Verses, Chapters, &c. (*Orient*, XII, 201).

editions before us, is to mention the fact that some mediaeval purists have inserted it in several places" (p. 135).

3. In ב at the beginning of a word when it has Sheva and is followed by מ, even though the previous word ends in one of the quiescent letters (י"ה"נ), e.g. פִּיבְמָקְלֵי (Gen. xxxii. 11). To this rule too Dr. Ginsburg offers objections. A very interesting and important chapter is the next, on the old Hebrew Orthography (pp. 137–157). It is universally recognized that the Semitic languages generally, and therefore also Hebrew, were devoid of Matres Lectionis.

These are supposed to have gradually found their way into the Biblical text (Chwolson, *Die Quiescentes in der althebräischen Orthographie*, 2nd volume of the Third International Congress, pp. 459, 474, 478). According to Lagarde (*Notes on the Greek Version of the Proverbs*, p. 7; *Mittheilungen*, I, 21) the Alexandrian Version is supposed to have been rendered from a text without Matres Lectionis.

Chajjuğ, the father of Hebrew grammar, is already supposed to have shared this view, as has been inferred from his remark that the copyist was in his time (about 1000 c. e.) permitted to write any word of the Bible plenē or defectivē (p. 137) according to his fancy; this monstrous assertion, which Bardowicz circulated, will be discussed elsewhere. We will here only mention the illustrations cited to show the development of Hebrew orthography in ancient times. For the omission of the נ thirteen examples are quoted: קצתי (Num. xi. 11); ותחו (2 Sam. xx. 9), &c. On account of the absent Mater Lectionis, the Massoretes have sometimes made a mistake in the vocalization, which can be restored from the LXX or Peschitta. (1) 2 Kings vii. 17, והמלך, according to the Massora וְהַמֶּלֶךְ = וְהַמֶּלֶךְ; conversely 2 Sam. xi. 1, where Massora should be corrected into המלכים. (2) Ps. xxxiii. 7 כנְךָ (כְּנָךְ) erroneously according to Exod. xv. 8 = כְּנָאָר = כְּנָאָר, cf. Ps. cxix. 83. (3) Prov. iii. 8 לְשֹׁאָר = לְשֹׁאָר = לְשֹׁאָר "to thy flesh." These emendations are reasonable and attractive, but not that of Gen. iv. 15 לְבָנָן (לְבָנָן) = אֲבָנָן, according to LXX; this,

however, is not Biblical Hebrew, for on this supposition there ought to be בְּחִיה. In postbiblical Hebrew very frequently occurs, and the Greek translator may have been misled by his taste for new Hebrew, which also undoubtedly often influenced Palestinian teachers. Then, by way of contrast, two examples are given in which, according to the Massora, נ should be eliminated, Exod. v. 7 חָקֵפָת and 2 Sam. xi. 24 וַיַּרְא הַמּוֹרִיאִים 24. But the Massora did not recognize that Ps. lxxv. 6 בְּצִוְאָר עַתָּק = בְּצִוְאָר עַתָּק, though "neck" does not make sense.

Like נ, י was also sometimes eliminated, e.g. בָּעֵל, בָּעֵל (according to the Aramaic ?); Amos vii. 8 should read בָּעֵי (instead of בָּעֵה); Ps. xxviii. 8 לְעֵנוֹ (instead of לְמַנוֹ, cp. Ps. xxix. 11 and the Versions); Mic. i. 10 פְּעֵבָן (instead of בְּכֻנוּ); Hos. vii. 6 יְשַׁׁעַן אֲפָחָם (instead of בְּכֻנוּ).

Seven examples are given where נ and י have been interchanged. An attempt is finally made to prove by the Massora that נ was not originally a Mater Lectionis. Examples are Gen. xxix. 34 קְרָא (Massoretic text) = קְרָא [נ]; ib., xlvi. 22 יְלָד [יְלָד] = יְלָד [ח], &c.

Dr. Ginsburg could on this point have referred to a small work of Mayer Lambert¹, who proves that those words ending in נ where the Massora reads u show traces of an obsolete form of the 3rd pers. plural feminine preterite, e.g. Deut. xxi. 7 שְׁפָכָה is really שְׁפָכָה, as in the Aramaic קְטַלָּה; נ also was not originally used as Mater Lectionis, and the Massora gives a list of those words where in our Text a waw, which might have been expected, is missing. The absence of a נ explains the difference in the two forms of the same text:

Ps. xiv. 7 יְשֻׁעָת יִשְׂרָאֵל and liii. 7 יְשֻׁעָת יִשְׂרָאֵל.

2 Sam. xxii. 26 גְּבוֹר חֲמִים and Ps. xviii. 26 גְּבוֹר חֲמִים in Samuel read גְּבוֹר with נ inserted, whilst in Ps. גְּבוֹר was read. Typical examples are given of the omission of the waw at the end of the word, e.g. Gen. xxxv. 26 יְלָד; Ex. xviii. 16 בָּא;

¹ *Une Série de Quatre Ketib, étude grammaticale*, Paris, 1891.

Num. xxxiii. 7 וַיֵּשֶׁב ; Deut. xxxii. 38 הִיְאָה ; in all of which passages the forms should be plural with a waw at the end. Further it is emphasized that originally the suffix denoting the 3rd pers. sing. was הַ and not הִ. Seven pages discuss the הִ as Mater Lectionis (pp. 150–157). It is pointed out that the plural originally ended in יִם, and not in יִם, and the Hiphil was written without the הִ. The Massora has not always recognized this and so made difficulties. The plural form of nouns was also originally written without a הִ ; hence the differences between 2 Sam. v. 6 וַיֵּשֶׁב הָעָרִין and 1 Chron. xi. 4 יָשְׁבָדִי (p. 154) ; 2 Kings xxv. 24 מַשְׁבָּדִי and Jer. xl. 9 מַעֲבָדִי. These instances seem to have been wrongly chosen, because they simply exemplify the transposition of letters and the mutation of הִ and הַ. Cf. Ex. xi. 6 בְּמִזְבֵּחַ, Sevirin בְּמִזְבֵּחַ ; xxxvii. 8, Kethib קְצוֹוֹתָה, Keri קְצֹוֹתָה, where the הַ has been placed in Kethib before הַ and changed into הִ. Examples of this kind are formed in the Keris. Also יִשְׁעָתָה already mentioned (Ps. xiv. 7) and יִשְׁעָות (Ps. liii. 7) can be explained in the same way. On page 156, n. 2, in reference to the burial of worn-out copies of the Torah in a scholar's grave, the author should have quoted not Maimonides but the original source, *T. B. Megilla*, 26 b.

There is no doubt whatever that the Biblical text in its most ancient form had the *scriptio continua*. In the division of words, mistakes may, here and there, have been made, of which there are traces in the Massoretic text, cp. 1 Kings xx. 33, &c. And, in this regard, there are some differences between the Alexandrian, Syriac, and Aramaic versions and the Massoretic text. Fifteen striking examples unfavourable to the Massoretic text are exhibited on p. 159 in a tabular form.

Criticism may justifiably avail itself of this expedient for clearing up difficult passages, even when the new division of words is unsupported by the ancient Versions. Very plausible are the following : Gen. xl ix. 19, 20, Massoretic text אָשָׁר עֲקָבָם : מְאַשֵּׁר עֲקָב : I Kings xix. 20, M. T. בְּשֵׁלָם מְהֻבָּשֶׂר, divide בְּשֵׁלָם הַמְּהֻבָּשֶׂר (p. 160). I add one

originating from S. D. Luzzato : Isaiah ix. 26, where וְאַפִּי עַל תְּבִילָתֶם makes no sense, is ἀπαξ λεγόμενον ; he divides וְאַפִּי עַל תְּבִלָּתֶם, which removes the difficulties.

The variations in word-divisions which are supported by ancient authorities are denoted in the Hebrew Bible with ל' makes no sense, is ἀπαξ λεγόμενον ; he divides וְאַפִּי עַל תְּבִלָּתֶם, which removes the difficulties.

The question as to the age of the final letters is dismissed in two pages (pp. 163–164). Two tables are given which show that the Massoretic text had final letters in the middle of words, and, conversely, ordinary letters at the end of words ; further that LXX divides words against the authority of the final letters in the Massoretic text. I refer the reader to pp. 100–106 of my work *Zur Einleitung in die Heilige Schrift*, 1894, where I have shown that, till the end of the first century, the double letters were often used promiscuously, and that the Talmud calls them מנצח in order to emphasize their value as finals.

Originally did not mean מנצח = “from thy prophets,” but מ ספק = “the final letters,” ס being pronounced like ס.

Pages 165–170 deal with abbreviations. Valuable is the statement concerning MSS. “The vacant space is generally filled out with dots or in unfinished letters.”

Some MSS. place at the end of the line several letters of the following word, which is then rewritten in full on the next line. Others place the letters for which there is no room on the line, above the line or at right angles to it instead of on the line in the margin (e.g. Lev. xv. 31 מִנְפְּמָאתֶם).

Ten typical examples are next given which are either supported by the ancient Versions or are purely conjectural. These are also marked ל' and ל'', respectively. The emendation of Exod. viii. 3 יְהוָה[אמֵר] אָמַר is not an improvement, for the context demands a different sequence of words: בְּאַשְׁר אָמַר אֱלֹהִינוּ יְהוָה. Whether there were רָאשִׁי תְּבוֹתָה in the Bible has been

discussed by F. Perles in his *Analekten zur Textkritik des alten Testaments*, Munich, 1895, an essay rich in brilliant ideas, to which I have made some additions in the *Revue des Études Juives* (pp. 154–157). An old source of copyists' mistakes is the *homoioteleuton*, from which the Bible text has also suffered considerably (pp. 171–182). After giving eight examples from the Codices, the author continues: "These examples might be multiplied almost indefinitely. If the omissions in the Hebrew Text due to this cause occur not only in the very first or oldest MS., but continue in the succeeding MSS. produced in different centuries and various countries, and also appear in the very latest Codex copied by the human hand, it is perfectly certain that the same source of error was in operation by the production of MSS. prior to those which we now possess. In the absence of these MSS., however, the only course left to us is carefully to examine the ancient Versions, which were made from a Hebrew recension older by more than a millennium than the oldest MSS. of the present Massoretic text" (p. 173). This position is proved by twelve examples taken from the LXX (Joshua six, Judges two, Samuel three, Kings one). 1 Kings viii. 16 is to be completed according to LXX and 2 Chron. vi. 6. The parallels from Chronicles often diminish, however (p. 174), the value of the LXX as a guide; for, like the Peschitta, the LXX often directly borrows its supplements from the parallel passages. Five examples (Joshua two, Judges one, Samuel two) are given of the converse, where the homoioteleuton has caused omissions in the LXX¹.

Dr. Ginsburg believes (p. 178) in the genuineness of two verses, Josh. xxi. 36, 37, notwithstanding the statement in those codices which accept these verses, that the Book of

¹ Correct p. 176: נאשֶׁר הָשַׁמְּרִים in נאשֶׁר הָשַׁמְּרִים (ו with dagesh); הָשַׁמְּרִים (ו dagesh); נאשֶׁר הָשַׁמְּרִים (ו dagesh); וְעַזְבֵּן in וְעַזְבֵּן; תְּמֻלֵּת (ז dagesh); תְּמֻלֵּת (ז dagesh); p. 177: עַמּוֹ (ט dagesh); קָצֵן (צ without dagesh); תְּמֻלֵּת read עַמּוֹ; וְעַזְבֵּן (ז without dagesh); top of p. 172, instead of Jeremiah xxxi. 30 read 29 or 28; p. 176, instead of Joshua xxiv. 6 read xxiv. 4.

Joshua consists of 656 verses, and the middle of the Book is chapter xiii. 26 (and not 25 as p. 88 says), contradicts this assumption, as has already been pointed out by Nozzi. Dr. Ginsburg thinks that the computation of the number of the verses as 656 is to be attributed to another Massoretic School. Where, however, is the number 658 given? Dropped-out words which Dr. Ginsburg restores from the LXX are marked in his Notes to the Hebrew Bible with the abbreviation ינ"ב.

The chapter on Keri and Kethib (pp. 183–186) is rather meagre. It is mentioned that these have come down to us in three forms—written on the border of the MSS., in separate lists, and in various collections compiled from various standpoints in the Massoretic works. The editor also states that the Codices vary materially, so that all the Kethib Keris could only be ascertained by examining all MSS. Dr. Ginsburg has noted all those he has used, which is more than most editions have done.

Concerning the origin of the division into separate books, &c., which Elias Levita already discussed in the third preface to the *Massoreth Ha-Massoreth*, there is hardly any information. There is some plausibility in the theory that in the doubtful cases the consonants of the Text were left unpunctuated, and in the notes the punctuation was first given according to the Kethib and then according to the Keri (more correctly קרי like נִלְהָ part. pass. Peal, just like בְּתִיב). Dr. Ginsburg only adopts this course wherever the Keri and the Kethib differ; otherwise the word is punctuated in the text, e.g. וַיָּלֹא i Sam. ii. 3, to which the note is added וַיָּלֹא קָרֵי; ii. 14 בְּשֶׁלֶת קָרֵי note בְּשֶׁלֶת; Gen. xlix. 11 עִירָה note קָרֵי עִירָה. Where therefore Keri only corrects the orthography, the vowels are given in the text—so I think Dr. Ginsburg's procedure is to be interpreted. The following instances are, however, incomprehensible to me. i Sam. i. 17, the text reads שְׁלֹתָךְ קָרֵי note שְׁלֹתָךְ. If the difference here between Kethib and Keri is not merely in the orthography but also in the reading, why does Dr. Ginsburg, against his

own principles, punctuate the word in the text? In Chron. xii. 39 the text gives שָׁרֵית and a note שְׁאַרְיָת קְרִי.

What is the distinction between שָׁרֵית and שְׁאַרְיָת that led the editor to punctuate the former word in the text, while he left the latter without vowels? Why does he supply Job vi. 2 וְהִיא with vowels in the text, and add the note וְהִיא קְרִי, while Isa. iii. 6 has no vowels in the text, and, in the note, it is stated נִטּוֹת כְּתִיב נִטּוֹת קְרִי, the difference in both cases being between וְ and ? Job xxxi. 11 lacks וְהִיא וְ ? Job xxxi. 4 is יְלִדוֹ כְּתִיב וְ and ib. xxxviii. 26 there is a note בְּנֶפֶוֹ אֲוֹ בְּנֶפֶוֹ כְּתִיב. Where does the author find the justification for the form בְּנֶפֶוֹ since Chaggai ii. 12 reads בְּנֶפֶת ; Ezek. xvi. 8 and Ruth iii. 9 בְּנֶפֶק ? Not surely from Baer's note of interrogation on בְּנֶפֶוֹ ibid., in his edition, p. 70.

Connected with the Keris are the Sevirin (pp. 187–196) which “in many instances preserve the primitive textual readings” (p. 193). We accept this view which Geiger strongly championed.

The Sevirin (= סְבִירִין), one might think, would have preserved the original reading, Gen. xl ix. 13 עד instead of לְ. This is supported by MSS., the Samaritan Text, Onkelos, LXX, the Syriac, and the Vulgate; Exod. vi. 27 מִצְרָיִם (instead of מִארְץ מִצְרָיִם) ; ib. xxv. 39 and xxvi. 31 פֻשָׂעָה (instead of פֻשָׂעָה) ; Num. xxxiii. 8 (instead of מִפְּנֵי תְּחִירֹת), מִפְּנֵי חִירֹת, &c. The Sevirin, which represent a luminous textual criticism, were gradually suppressed and quite ignored. Jacob ben Chajim only knew 200, which Frensdorff in *Masora Magna*, I, 369–373, collected without increasing their number. Dr. Ginsburg, on the other hand, has noted about 350—quite a respectable increase. These may be further supplemented from the מִטְעִין, as they were hostilely styled, and also from the Codices.

Several סְבִירִין are given in Biblical MSS. as קְרִי and vice versa. Dr. Ginsburg therefore says, “It will thus be seen that the identical variant which is called Keri by one

School of Massoretes is called Sevir by another School" (p. 188). Perhaps after all we have only before us the same notices under various names.

In any case Dr. Ginsburg deserves thanks for securing a just appreciation of the Sevirin and noting them *in locis*. Baer only added them at the end. Hahn's Bible (reprinted Leipzig, 1893) has only two Sevirin on its margin which have also been copied in Letteris' edition, published by the English Bible Society.

Very instructive is the collection and discussion of the differences between the Maarbai (Western Palestinian) and Madincha (Eastern Babylonian) readings. Dr. Ginsburg has here (pp. 197-240) not only placed at our disposal an increased mass of material gathered from the original MSS., but has also, as far as I can judge, most critically sifted this material and improved several notes in his editions of the text.

Our editions follow, as is known, the Palestine Recension. Judaism recognized the Palestinian authority for Scripture and the Babylonian Talmud for that of Oral law.

There follows an account of the differences between Ben Asher and Ben Naphtali (pp. 241-286). Dr. Ginsburg opposes the view which has prevailed since Levitas, that the extant Biblical text represents Ben Asher's Recension and that of the "Westerns," for it also contains readings of Ben-Naphtali. Thus, too, MSS. should not be classified on their accidentally exhibiting readings of Ben Asher or Ben Naphtali¹ (p. 247).

Dr. Ginsburg gives a most minutely detailed account of the variations between these two schools. (1) יישכר (pp. 250-254). (2) Certain forms of the root אכל (pp. 255-263). The discussion of all passages and reference to MSS. and ancient printed editions proves that in the large majority of cases Ben Naphtali's reading is accepted (p. 263). (3) Forms of נרש (pp. 264-266); (4) the Dagesh in בחרם (pp.

¹ וין אנחנו סומכין על קרייתו: [של בן אשר] בכל הארץ הallow ואנשי מורה סומכין על קריית בן נפתלי.

264–265); (5) about words with בָּ and בְּ followed by a וּ (pp. 265–268), e. g. בַּיִשְׁרָאֵל or בְּיִשְׁרָאֵל, &c.; (6) the use or omission of the Dagesh in בְּנִדְכְּפָת in different cases.

Next are given carefully prepared tables of the differences between the two schools and a synoptical list of the paragraphs of the *Dikduke Hateamim*. Nine items sum up the results of Dr. Ginsburg's comparison of the MSS. (pp. 285, 286). He condemns Baer-Strack's edition as not corresponding with the traditions embodied in the MSS. Dr. Ginsburg gives here, as in other passages of his *Introduction*, the sources of several traditions which he has copied in his Massora. I will now devote a separate section to "The Massora, its rise and development," which takes up five chapters, the fifth chapter consisting of thirteen sub-chapters.

4.

Through a printer's error, the section dealing with the Massora discusses matter which had already been dealt with. Compare sub-chapter 2, "The division of consonants into words," with chapter iii, "The division of words"; sub-chapter 3, "The introduction of the final letters," with chapter iv, "The double and final letters"; sub-chapter 7, "The introduction of the *Matres Lectionis*," with chapter ii, "The orthography." I also cannot understand why chapter vii, "The Keri and Kethib"; chapter viii, "The readings called Sevirin"; chapter ix, "The Western and Eastern Recensions"; chapter x, "The differences between Ben Asher and Ben Naphtali," do not belong to the Massora, as their discussion antecedently to the treatment of the Massora would lead us to infer that the consolidated treatment of these heads would have saved space and been more convenient to the reader.

First of all the introduction of the square characters is discussed (pp. 277–296). As I have treated these points most minutely in my *Zur Einleitung in die Heilige Schrift* (pp. 48–80), a work which appeared in 1894, but has not

been noticed by Dr. Ginsburg, nor even mentioned in his Index of Literature, p. 295, n. 1, I refer the reader to that essay and confine myself to several corrections.

Inaccurate is the statement (p. 28) that R. Jehuda I, the Patriarch, flourished 140–163 c. E., and that a Halachic Collection by R. Nathan is known under the title: *Mishna or Tosephtha di R. Nathan*. Dr. Ginsburg probably thinks of *Aboth d. R. Nathan*. The Patriarch Jehuda I died certainly not earlier than 189 c. E. and in the year 140 had not yet become patriarch. Mar Ukba was a Babylonian and not a Palestinian as the reader is led to believe (p. 288, l. 4). The Ancient Hebrew Text was probably called רען and not רענָה. The uncertainty of the latter reading רענָה should at least have been noted.

Dr. Ginsburg does not quote all the data of the Jewish tradition bearing on the subject, nor does he exhibit any systematic demonstration of his statement that the ancient Hebrew text was still extant in the second century. Nevertheless he comes (p. 290) to the same conclusion at which I arrived.

As the Ancient Hebrew characters had been so long in use, it was natural that, in its gradual transformation into the square writing, several mistakes should have crept in. Dr. Ginsburg points out (pp. 291–96) several instances where, in our text, נ and ת, ר and צ, ב and ד are interchanged, these letters having a marked similarity of form in the Phoenician writing. Generally known is Luzzato's conjecture that Isa. ii. 15 should read בעצם רוחו and not ר' בעים. After discussing the introduction of the separation of words and the differences in this regard (pp. 296, 297), the question of the introduction of final letters is again discussed (pp. 297–299). Here, too, I may refer the reader to my *Zur Einleitung*, pp. 100–105, with the results of which Dr. Ginsburg partly agrees. The citation p. 289, n. 1 בשם ר' שמואל ר' יצחק should be corrected בשם ר' שמואל בר יצחק. The translation: "R. Jeremiah said in the name of R. Samuel who said it in the name of R. Isaac," should therefore be altered into: "the son of

Isaac," for רַב יִצְחָק in *T. P. Megilla* 71 d 35 is a printer's error for בָּר יִצְחָק. The introduction of the Matres Lectionis is again briefly discussed, and the more than courageous view is propounded that this formed one of the points of disputation between the Sadducees and Pharisees. Then follows a fifth sub-chapter: "The Consonant of the Hebrew Text and the Septuagint" (pp. 300–468). This collects and discusses in thirteen sections the Massoretic data in the Talmud and Midrash.

The LXX is dealt with less fully. Only one passage is translated from Aristeas' letter and one from the Talmud.

The varying attitude of the Jews to the Greek Version and the Greek language has been treated by Joel in his *Blicke in die Religionsgeschichte*, I, 1–42, to which the reader may be referred. An appendix on the deviations of the LXX from the Hebrew texts noted in the Talmud, promised on p. 302, n. 1, is not given. The word בְּכָל is missing on page 303, line 9.

Dr. Ginsburg shows that the development of the schools had, as its chief result, the fixing of the Hebrew text of the Bible, and that this was originally directed against the Samaritan and Greek versions. Although several essays have been written on the History of the Jewish school system, Dr. Ginsburg's short account contains several mistakes. He says (p. 304, towards the end), "Simon b. Shetach (80 b.c.) introduced upper schools or academies in every large provincial town, and ordained that all young men from the age of sixteen were to visit them" (cp. *T. Jer. Kethuboth*, VIII, 11). The reference given says nothing of the kind, but only that Simon b. Shetach introduced three institutions, of which one was שִׁיחָיו הַתְּנִינּוֹת וּלְכִינּוֹן לְבֵית הַסְּפָר "that the children should attend elementary schools." There is no mention of upper schools or "academy." And how could an order that every one over sixteen should attend an Academy be practically enforced? This would be equivalent to compelling every young man in modern times to attend a University.

The *locus classicus* is *T. B. Baba Bathra*, 21 a, where the introduction of Elementary Schools, but not of Higher Schools, is credited to Josephus' contemporary Josuah b. Gamala, who, at the same time, adopted a regulation that children should be taken to school at the early age of six and seven and not when sixteen years old as had hitherto been the case, because these grown-up youths proved often intractable. Simon b. Shetach is mentioned in *T. B. Kidduschin*, 66 a, as having restored learning to the country after the massacre of the Sages by Jannai. I must also correct the quotation on p. 305, n. 2, where instead of *Pesachim*, 12 a, it should read 112 a. Further, the citations on p. 305, note 4, are not relevant to the text. After the discussion of מקריא סופרים and עטור סופרים, which I submit is not full enough to satisfy the standard set up by Geiger, Dr. Ginsburg discusses, on pp. 309–316, the *Lecta sed non scripta*, and on pp. 317–319 the *Scripta sed non lecta*.

In reference to 2 Sam. viii. 3 Dr. Ginsburg copies without acknowledgment the view first enunciated by me in my *Masoretische Untersuchungen*, p. 52. The original text of 2 Sam. xviii. 20 was, I suggested, the Kethib. The word בְּנֵי חַיִב וְלֹא בְּנֵי בָּן. This note was misunderstood and was taken to mean that the בְּנֵי which was not written was to be the reading.

Acceptable is the suggestion (p. 310) that Jer. xxxi. 37 (not 38) should be בְּנֵי אֶחָד (= בְּנֵי אֶחָד), a dittography of בְּנֵי. On the *puncta extraordinaria* (pp. 318–334) Dr. Ginsburg has fully accepted the views which I have expressed in my *Masoretische Untersuchungen*. A lengthy notice of these pages is therefore unnecessary.

The age of these "extraordinary points" I have discussed in my *Zur Einleitung* (pp. 113–120), which also contains several supplements that have apparently escaped Dr. Ginsburg's attention. I must refer the reader to my work and leave to him the task of comparison between Dr. Ginsburg's and my treatment of this topic. I will only note that Dr. Ginsburg quotes from the MSS. a Massoretic

note on Ps. xxvii. 13 where מִלְמָלָתָה is missing. Of my view that the punctuation of this verse shows a dislocation of the Biblical text Dr. Ginsburg has not even thought it worth while to make mention. The origin of the four suspended letters discussed on pp. 334–341 I have tried to explain in my *Masoretische Untersuchungen*, p. 46 sqq. In my *Zur Einleitung*, p. 106 sq., I have pointed out that the Talmud does not know the suspended y in Job xxxviii. 13 and that it is probably due to a misunderstood note, as ב' מְרַשּׁׁעִים תְּלִיָּה 'y, which was taken to mean: "Both Ain in מְרַשּׁׁעִים to be suspended," whilst what was really meant was "the Ain in the second מְרַשּׁׁעִים, i. e. in xxxviii. 15, is to be suspended." The suspended y in Ps. lxxx. 14 is a big Ain¹, which, according to *Kiddushin*, 30 a, originally marked the division of the letters of the Psalter. But, as the Psalms possessed an uneven number of letters, it was said וְהַעֲזֵן תְּלִיָּה, which was wrongly taken to mean that the "Ain" was suspended.

So too Judges xviii. 30 may owe the suspended Nun to a note נ במשה חולין.² We need only assume (Job xxxviii. 15) that a scribe in a copy which became a model for future copyists wrote the enlarged y above the line, and that thus the suspended y became perpetuated.

Closer examination of the passages shows that Dr. Ginsburg has copied a mistake in translating the words: בַּמְיֹון בְּנֵה חִיאָל בֵּית הָאָלִי (1 Kings xvi. 34); he translates: "In his days (i. e. Ahab's) did Hiel of the house of Eli build Jericho (p. 330)." It should, however, be rendered "Chiel of Beth El."

Contrary to his custom, from which he only occasionally deviates, Dr. Ginsburg gives here the sources of the Hebrew

¹ It is noteworthy that the Rabbinic Bible of Felix Pratensis (1517) contains indeed in שׁׁוֹבֵן an Ain majuscum, as Dr. Ginsburg mentions, p. 340.

² Koenigsberger, in his *Aus Massorah- und Talmud-Kritik*, asks, in objection to my opinion, whether I really think that Jonathan was a grandson of Moses. His objection should be addressed to the compiler of the Book of Judges, who was certainly of that opinion.

quotations (p. 342, n. 2, p. 343, n. 1 and 2, p. 344, n. 1, and p. 346, n. 1) in the Hebrew language ; he usually translates. He does not count on readers who could verify such quotations in the original. For the explanation of the Talmudic citations see my *Masoretische Untersuchungen*, p. 56, particularly on the one quoted by Dr. Ginsburg, p. 341, n. 1. Dr. Ginsburg also repeats the old views concerning the *Nun inversae* (pp. 342-345). He does not think it worth while to mention my opinion that these reversed Nuns were first introduced in the eighth century, whilst originally Num. x. 35 and 36 and Ps. cxvii. 23-28, 40, had only points, and that נ is an abbreviation of נקוֹד, although a scholar like Neubauer approves the suggestion and supports it with proofs (see the JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, III, 1891, p. 540).

In R. Simon ben Jochai's remark on (Gen. xxxiii. 4) : הַלְכָה בִּרוּע שָׁעֵשׂ שָׁוֹנָא לְעַקְבָּא אֶלָּא נְהַפְּכוּ רְחִמּוֹ וּכְיֻדָּה the word הַלְכָה is not clear. In my *Masoretische Untersuchungen*, p. 23, I have suggested הַלְכָה, but I do not maintain this suggestion.

Professor Bacher communicated to me some time ago his view that the reading might have been הַלְכָה בִּירְנֵנו. It seems to me that originally it only said הַלְכָה, which is also synonymous with traditions, as one sees from *T. B. Nazir*, 30 a, and בִּידּוּעַ is an explanatory comment.

Dr. Ginsburg's statement (p. 343) that the Patriarch Jehuda I said that the Thora consists of seven books is wrong. The two quotations, referred to in the note, only state that an Amora enumerated this view, basing it on the opinion of the Patriarch (*Sabbath*, 115 b), (not as is wrongly given on p. 343, n. 1, where besides בַּמְאָן כָּרְבִּי is to be added).

Dr. Ginsburg (p. 342, n. 1) appeals to *Sifre* on Numbers, p. 22 a, edit. Friedmann, and does not notice the difficulty presented by this passage. It is as follows :—

וַיֹּהֵי בְּנַסְעַת הָאָרֶן נְקוֹד עַלְיוֹ מְלֻמָּעָלָה וּמְלֻמָּתָה מִפְנֵי שְׁלָא הִיה וְזֶה מְקוֹמוֹ :
רְבִי אָוֹمֵר וּכְיֻדָּה רְבִישׁ אָוֹמֵר נְקוֹד עַלְיוֹ מְלֻמָּעָלָה וּמְלֻמָּתָה מִפְנֵי שְׁלָא הִיה
זֶה מְקוֹמוֹ :

The same explanation is given twice in one and the same passage! Once anonymously, and again in the name of Simon ben Jochai. Possibly the text is defective and should be corrected according to *T. B. Sabbath*, 116 a, where the same Boraitha is quoted as follows:—

רישׁ ב' ג' ר' ש' אומר עתידה פרשה זו שתיעקר מכאן
וחכתב במקומה :

I shall be grateful if a more satisfactory explanation is offered.

After the euphemistic readings, e. g. *ישכבה*: *ישכבה* : *ישגלה*, have been mentioned in sub-chapter viii (pp. 346, 347) the author proceeds to treat of "Corrections of the Sopherim." He gives three lists: *Mechilta*, 39 a (11); *Sifre*, 22 b (7); *Tanchuma on Exodus*, xv. 7 (17). *Jalkut*, I, § 247¹ is derived from the *Mechilta*, but one Tikkun Soferim has dropped out, hence Dr. Ginsburg regards this list as an independent one. It must be emphasized that the original reading was *כינה* הכתוב, as *Mechilta* and *Sifre* show. The *Midrash Tanchuma* also consistently has *אלא שכנה הכתוב* and only in the introduction do we find: *וכנהו הכתוב שהוא תיקון סופרים אנשי הכנסת הנדרולה*.

Ben Asher also says (*Dikduke Hateamim*, p. 44): *וראוים* (cp. the emendations of the whole quotation in *Masoretische Untersuchungen*, p. 49), and employs the technical expression *אלא שרינה הכתוב* א. When therefore the Massora only speaks of *itchikon sopherim* it is doubtful whether these are "emendations," i.e. definite corrections, as Dr. Ginsburg insists they are. There is much probability in S. Pinsker's supposition that, in ancient times, only eleven paraphrases were known, viz. those given in the *Mechilta*, where, however, by a confusion יא = 18 (*Kerem Chemed*, IX, 52). Dr. Ginsburg does not mention this view, which does not fit in with his system. He deals with this question minutely in order to show that changes of text have here been made designedly (pp. 347–363, not p. 349 as in the index).

¹ Dr. Ginsburg gives in the text (p. 349) p. "151" and in the note ז' דף ש(?)

On this part we will only make a few remarks. To avoid repeating what has already been said elsewhere, I will refer the reader to *Masoretische Untersuchungen*, pp. 50 et seqq., where the "corrections" on Num. xi. 15; Mal. i. 12; Zech. ii. 12; and 2 Sam. xvi. 12 are discussed. That all Tikkune Soferim are not improvements is clearly evident from the Massoretic note on Num. xii. 12, where our text is undoubtedly original; אשר בצאתו מرحم אמו ונו' ; אשר בצאתו מرحم אמנו ויאכל חציبشرנו בבבורי 11, which is senseless. So, too, Jer. ii. 1, as the first half of the verse shows. The same is true of Ps. cxi. 20, where בקדם is also not a supplementary emendation.

After Dr. Ginsburg has quoted some examples of the removal of "Impious expressions towards the Almighty" (pp. 363-367) he discusses in detail the textual alterations that originated in a sense of the holiness of the Tetragrammaton (pp. 367-399).

A comparison between 2 Sam. v. 19-25 and 1 Chron. xiv. 10-16 and of 2 Sam. vi. 9, 11, 17, and 1 Chron. xiii. 12, 14; xvi. 1, &c., shows that יהוה has been replaced by אלהים. Interesting is the demonstration that names beginning with יה, like יהואחו, &c., have, out of reverence for God's name, often been converted into names beginning with י, like יאהו, &c. In this demonstration the author is very thorough, and not less so in his treatment of the word הילליה and of proper names ending in יה and יהו, of which 141 have been found. The transformation of idolatrous into inoffensive names is also made clear (ירבעל = ירבעת, &c.) (pp. 400-404). The desire to emphasize the Unity of the Temple Service in Jerusalem is also responsible for many a change in the text (pp. 404-407). At this point Dr. Ginsburg enunciates his conclusion that our text is essentially identical with the text fixed 100 years before the Christian era. In this connexion the Talmudic account of the three codices found in the temple-court is discussed, and the interesting statement is made that in the Pentateuch נא

occurs 656 times, of which 457 are masculine and 199 feminine (p. 409). The thirty-two variants of the "Severus Codex" (Epstein, *Monatsschrift*, XXXIV, 337–351, and Neubauer in *Studia Biblica*, III, 19) are severally quoted and discussed. The Soferim were the editors and revisers of the text; the Massoretes¹ are the conservators of the tradition, but not revisers.

The Massora Parva, Massora Magna, and Massora Finalis are now shortly described, and their contents illustrated by several specimens. Dr. Ginsburg shows, at the same time, that the Massora Parva and Magna were already fully developed in the ninth century. The differences between the Massoretes are pointed out, and it is demonstrated that they have taken their accounts from different codices. Variations exist not only between the Occidentals and the Orientals, but even among the representatives of the Occidental School, from which our *textus receptus* is derived. This is shown by the Variae Lectiones of the authoritative codices quoted by the Massora. Such are: יריחו (1); יונקי (2); ספר הלוי (3); ספר מורה (4); ירושלמי (5); according to Levitas' view only the Pentateuch; ספר סיני (6); חומש יריחו (also) (7); ספר עירא (8); מהזורה רבא (9); ספר בבלי (10). As the Massoretes often dispute concerning vowels and accents, Dr. Ginsburg takes the opportunity of giving his opinion on the age of these written signs. He does not tell us anything new. That the signs in question were not yet in existence in the fifth century is proved from the *Midrash Rabba* on Canticles i. 11–11 b, Wilna, as Rappoport has already pointed out, though Dr. Ginsburg does not mention it. According to Levitas this can be

¹ Dr. Ginsburg, p. 421, n. 1, writes still פָּסֹרֶת and remarks: "The older form of it used in the Mishna is פָּסֹרֶת *Massoreth* (*Abot*, III, 20)," although Bacher (JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, III, 785–790) has shown that the only correct vocalization is פָּסֹרֶת, and that פָּסֹרֶת represents a comparatively later formation of פָּסֹרֶת. I notice that S. Baer, also, in his later work (*Orient*, vol. XII, and elsewhere), almost always writes "Messoreth" and not "Massorah," conscious of the correct and original form of the word.

demonstrated from *Baba Bathra*, 21 a b, and *Soferim*, IV, 8, 9. Levitas is of the opinion that accents and vowels came into existence about 650-680. The section on the Massora, consisting of 182 pages, closes with a short discussion of the supra-linear system of punctuation and a list of the punctators.

5.

One of the most important and learned chapters is the *History and description of the MSS.*, which occupies 210 pages and discusses sixty MSS.

It would have been desirable to have had a decisive statement of the mutual relations of the codices, or, to use the technical phrase, *their affiliation*. Only thus could correct conclusions be arrived at; for, however numerous the copies of a standard MS. are, they can only be regarded as one witness.

Dr. Ginsburg unfortunately has not done this. He writes in the introductory remark to this paragraph (p. 469) : "In describing the MSS. which I have collected for my Massoretico-critical text, I find it more convenient to classify them according to the countries and libraries in which they are found ; and according to the order in which they are given in the catalogue of the respective collections wherever that is possible." That a description according to these principles cannot be called history no one will question. It is a mere accident whither the MSS. of the Bible drifted. In spite of this fundamental error, we are grateful to the author for the information which he offers us, because he affords us an insight into the character of the existing codices, and lays the foundation for an investigation of Scriptural tradition.

We do not doubt but that a careful study of this material which Dr. Ginsburg has collected will yield rich results. Our author only makes an exception in the case of the ancient MS., 2445 Brit. Mus., which contains the Pentateuch, and is said to have been written 820-850 c. E., and

of the famous St. Petersburg codex of the Prophets, which is dated the year 916.

Dr. Ginsburg also prints, in his Introduction, a facsimile of the former ; he does not, however, strange to say, append the paleographic description to this facsimile, but to another facsimile which is omitted.

Dr. Ginsburg says (p. 474) "an autotype facsimile page of this important MS. is given at the end of this Introduction." He can only refer to the page before his description of the MSS. because no other is given. Why does Dr. Ginsburg not start with this facsimile ?

The assertion (p. 473) that this codex originally had no סוף פסוק is well worth mentioning. I find here a confirmation of my assertion that, in ancient times, the was ראש פסוק only became current later on (JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, IX, 129, n. 7). The author has put together in tabular form the sixty MSS. he describes. Whilst referring the reader to this table I shall limit my remarks to the material furnished by Dr. Ginsburg. I have endeavoured to show (*Zur Einleitung*, p. 44 ff.) that the Greek names of the separate books of the Pentateuch are translated from Hebrew names : Deuteronomion = משנה תורה ; Arithmoi (Numeri) = חומש הפקודים (cp. l. c. 45, n. 3); Exodus = ספר יציאת מצרים (Dikduke Hateamim, p. 57) ; Genesis = ספר מעשה בראשית.

Dr. Ginsburg (n. 481) quotes from a Biblical codex of the thirteenth century for Genesis : ספר ראשון והוא ספר בריאת עולם, which corresponds still closer with Γένεσις κόσμου (*Alex.*) and with the Syriac name בריתא. The same codex has for every one of the five books of Moses a double name expressive of the contents. Exodus = ספר יציאת משה ; Leviticus, Numeri, and Deut., מ' תורה ומצוות ; Deut., מ' הפקודים ורמב"ן ; Num., מ' מנחה תורה ובמירות משה רבינו.

The words "Departure of our teacher Moses" imply that the last eight verses of Deuteronomy, where Moses' death is related, belong to the Law of Moses, a point on which there already existed a difference of opinion amongst

the Tannaites (*Baba Bathra*, 14 b); this is alluded to by Ben Asher (*Dikduke Hateamim*, p. 1): סיום התורה כتورה, i.e. the eight concluding verses belong to the rest of Thora, and are ascribed to Moses. As the names of the books of the Pentateuch correspond with those of the LXX they are certainly very ancient and not invented by the Massoretes or the copyists. Dr. Ginsburg's assertion that follows, concerning the MS. in question, is correct. "The Massorah in the MS. is most accurate and important. I have therefore made it the basis of my edition of this Corpus. It was only in those cases where it failed in certain lists that I reproduced the rubrics from other MSS. which I duly indicate in this chapter" (p. 484).

The author, at the beginning of the second part of his work (pp. 114-136), shows most minutely that the Dagesh exceptions like בְּכָל לֶבֶן (Ps. ix. 2), רַעֲמָה (Gen. x. 7), &c. are not justified. He is so bitterly opposed to Baer that, though he does not name him, he never misses an opportunity, when he cites a MS. or an edition, of pointing out that it tells against certain punctuations. These constant reiterations become at last wearisome and take up valuable space, which might have been filled to better purpose. It would have been sufficient if Dr. Ginsburg had said once for all: "Of the Bible codices examined by me only a few support Baer's emendations, while the majority are opposed to them." Further, he ought not to have ignored the fact that Baer relies on Ben Asher's authority (cp. *Liber Genesis*, ed. S. Baer, Lipsiae, 1869, Praefatio, p. vii f.). The author's descriptions become very monotonous, as the intrinsic value of the MSS. is only discussed from this and a few other stand-points. At least, this is so in the majority of cases.

We will now cite one passage where the author is brief, and which at the same time gives a fair idea of the points most discussed:—

"The MS. exhibits no hiatus or break in the middle of the verse in Gen. iv. 8, nor has it any marginal remark that some codices have it. It reads בְּשִׁים with *Pathach* under

the *Gimel* in Gen. vi. 3. Though the scribe omitted the two verses in Josh. xxi., viz. 36, 37, the Massoretic annotator deliberately supplied them in the margin with the proper vowel-points and accents. It has not Neh. vii. 68, nor is there any notice in the margin that this verse occurs in any other codices. בֵית־אָל Bethel is invariably written in two words. The innovation of (1) inserting *Dagesh* into the consonant after the guttural with *Sheva*, or (2) into the first letter of a word when the preceding word happens to end with the same letter, or of (3) changing the *Sheva* into *Chateph Pathach* when a consonant with a simple *Sheva* is followed by the same consonant, has no support in this MS." (p. 592).

Whether כְּדָרְלַעֲמָר and חֹבֶל קִין are written in one or two words is generally noted.

Each description begins with a statement whether the writer was a Spaniard, German, Frenchman, Italian or Oriental,—a practice which is very commendable. Then we are told that Exodus xv, Deuteronomy xxxii, Judges v, and 2 Samuel xxii are, according to rule, written in verse form. Upon this follows a comparison of the divisions of the Lections (Parshioth) with those in the *textus receptus*. When *Gaya* and *Metheg* are inserted, we are told where and how much of the Massora is given in the codex, &c. Naturally special peculiarities of the different codices and editions are occasionally discussed, but the plan of the description is to deal with the points just noted; and I cannot refrain from the remark that clearness of review and succinctness would have been served by a tabular statement.

Dr. Ginsburg has dealt in separate chapters with the external division of the Text, Part I, chapters ii, iv, v. It would have been of advantage to the reader if all the material had been put together. Any one who wishes to study the problem of the external division of the Bible has first to collect and arrange the material from the various parts of this work, a task which Dr. Ginsburg with his remarkable skill in this direction could have accom-

plished most ably. Still, I will not on account of this omission deny my acknowledgments for the large mass of interesting matter here printed.

I wish to draw attention to a few data which show that our Hebrew text, although ancient in regard to its consonants, did not, as late as 1000 years ago, possess the same exterior form as Jacob ben Chajim's edition has since given it. It is believed that the final letters always had the same form as they now possess, and Biblical students think that the Greek translators were ignorant of them, or else they would not, in so many cases, have decided against the word-division of the Massora. It is therefore astounding to read that Dr. Ginsburg says: "The final letters זְנַן גְּנַן are, as a rule, no longer than the middle ones" (p. 634 and in several scrolls).

The Franco-German scroll especially, dating from the middle of the twelfth century (Brit. Mus. 21161), is one of the most important which has ever been described. There is naturally no trace of the dilatale letters מְהֻלָּה אֲלֻחָה which came later into use.

The lines are therefore not of the same uniform length. There is no distinction between מ and מ; ה and ה have a peculiar form; ש = שׁ and שׂ = שׂ. "Sometimes the point is both in the letter and above it so that it has the appearance of *Dagesh*, and sometimes it is not only without the point but without the *Raphè* stroke" (p. 634).

Of the individual punctuations an opinion can be formed by studying the following words:—

וַיִּשְׁמַע ; וַיַּחַת ; הַפְּזַבֵּחַ, לִזְבֹּחַ ; וְבָרִית (= בְּרִית), בְּלָא אַדְנִי ; עַלְיָה (= עַלְיָה) ; אָבִיו (= אָבִיו) ; יְנַצֵּחַ (= יְנַצֵּחַ) ; מְדִינָה ; תְּנִינָה (= תְּנִינָה) (pp. 636, 637).

Similar punctuations Dr. Ginsburg quoted (p. 769 seq.) from a codex in the National Library in Paris, which dates from the year 1286:—

אָחִין בֶּרֶע, נִיחָוֶת, הַצִּיעַן, שְׁלַחַ, הַפְּלַתִּי (יְרִי = שְׂרָרוּ, יְחִידָה).

Very interesting is the remark that several scribes often ornament the word which coincides with their names, e. g. בָּרֶזֶךְ Gen. xiv. 19, Deut. vii. 14 (p. 631). This circumstance enables Dr. Ginsburg to discover the name of many a copyist.

Here it should be mentioned that Baer, in order to support his punctuation of the word הַלְּלֵי, &c., cites a quotation from the codex, but omits the appended remark: "But I have not found it so in correct codices" (p. 662).

I will now make a few less important remarks. Page 544, n. 1. הַנְּקָדָם is translated "Creator." It seems far more correct to say: "He who existed from the very beginning."—p. 547 n., סֵךְ הַכָּל קָמֹן מוֹמָרִים (cf. also p. 777). It should be noticed that tradition also counts 147 Psalms (*T. J. Sabbath*, 15 c, ep. Müller, *Massecheth Soferim*, p. 222).—On p. 564 אֲלָפִים is to be placed after חמישת בְּנֵי נְסֵן. Is not to be translated "in the month of Nissan" but "on the eighth day of Nissan"; for בְּנֵי נְסֵן is not an abbreviation of נְסֵן.—P. 573, n. 2. שָׁבֵח לְבָרָא הָעוֹלָם בְּיהָה. Dr. Ginsburg has not translated the word בְּיהָה, as is frequently his practice when a word does not appear clear. The meaning is "He who created the world with the name יה." The idea is traceable to the Talmud.

וכן יהי רצון ויאמר אמן (p. 582, n. 1): "May He thus find favour"; as if had בְּרָצֵון. The sense is: "And may it be God's Will."

שֶׁלֶמֶה כתיבתו בשנת אנשי חמישת אלף ומאהים ושמונה. This, according to Dr. Ginsburg, means that the writer completed the codex in the year 5208 for R. Solomon. Whence did Dr. Ginsburg get the R. Solomon? Surely not out of אֱנֹשִׁים? The meaning of אֱנֹשִׁים left untranslated by Dr. Ginsburg I do not at the present moment know. Perhaps some one can explain.

בשנת ה'כ' פשותה, which correctly give the character of the year as Dr. Brann has informed me.

נדיים ט אותיות מנוראות—: 21. A MS. remarks on Job xii. 21: “From the Massorah on Job xii. 21 we learn the interesting fact that the school of Massoretes from which this MS. emanates included the verse in the number of passages with *Separated* or *Inverted Nun*.” By no means. For, in that case, it should have said: “there are inverted Nuns.” Here we have only an instance of misunderstanding of the annotator, who had lurking in his memory the fact that an inverted נ not only occurs in the phrase שפָך בּוֹ עַל־נְרִיבִים in Ps. cvii. 40 but also in Job xii. 21. He has mistakenly appended here this Massoretic note.—P. 741 we read in the epigraph: השם זיכני להנות בה וברוחמים לה אני ורעי ורعي עד סוף כל הדורות. Dr. Ginsburg has not translated the two underlined words. They do not seem to be a misprint. Still they ought to be corrected so as to read והבדומים לה, “and in similar works.”

A very beautiful MS. in the possession of the author is described pp. 734–743, which contains “The mnemonic name of each of the 54 pericopes into which the Pentateuch is divided, with a detailed list of the Sedarin therein, as well as the number of verses, words, and letters, which I have printed at the end of the respective Parashas in my edition of the Hebrew Bible” (p. 742). This is of great importance and deserves more notice than Dr. Ginsburg gives it.

This MS. contains: “A Massoretic treatise by Jacob ben-Naphtali which is new and will be found in the Appendix to this Introduction” (p. 743). The promised Appendix has unfortunately not been given, like so many other things which the author has promised in this work.

In the epigraph, p. 748, n. 1, one also finds the quotation במתואשת מתא, which Dr. Ginsburg in his literal translation passes over in silence. This name, apparently of a French place, is not noted in Gross’ *Gallia Judaica*, and I cannot identify it.

P. 773, n. 1. “The number of the letters” is surely a mistake for “the number of words,” for the former

Dr. Ginsburg has given us in four lines. The Vienna Codex (Imperial and Royal Library, no. 4) gives the *Hagiography* in the following order :—1. Song of Songs, 2. Ruth, 3. Lamentations, 4. Ecclesiastes, 5. Esther, 6. Psalms, 7. Proverbs, 8. Job, 9. Daniel, 10. Ezra, Nehemiah, and 11. Chronicles (p. 377). Dr. Ginsburg says that this order is not found in his collection on p. 7. And yet this order is identical with that of the five oldest editions, and with that which Dr. Ginsburg himself accepts in his Hebrew Bible, except that the five scrolls are placed at the beginning and are arranged according to their Liturgical order.—On the same page נחרטו קהילות הקדש is inaccurately rendered : “The sacred synagogues were destroyed” instead of “communities.”

6.

Almost 200 pages are taken up with the history of the printed Hebrew Text. Under twenty-four numbered headings, the author critically describes and discusses all printed editions from the year 1477, when the Psalms appeared, till the year 1525, when Jacob ben Chajim's Rabbinic Bible and the Massora saw the light.

In this part the author gives not a mere description but a real history, in which the mutual relation of the different editions is determined and the critical value of each is closely defined. Although the material which is derived from the MSS. is the more valuable, still we contend that in this chapter, in which Dr. Ginsburg is able to rely on previous workers, he is most successful.

The editions discussed are tabulated ; those to which reference is made are noted. We refer the reader to the table.

Our Biblical text represents the German recension, because Germans were the first to institute printing-presses, and printing was generally known as a “German Art.” Cp. Chwolson, *ראשית מעשיה הדרפוס בישראל*, translated from the Russian by M. Eisenstadt, Warsaw, 1897, n. 6, where

there also is discussed the difficult passage לְכָל סֹד which forms the second half of the verse in the epigraph of the first printed Hebrew work, the אַרְבָּעָה טוֹרִים of Jacob ben Asher (1475, Pieve di Sacco). Chwolson cites from De Rossi, נִסְגָּרָת לְקַט הַקְמָה of Moses Chagis on Eben Haezer מסותרת ; Dr. Ginsburg prints, p. 780, n. 1, נִסְגָּרָת, which cannot by any possibility be grammatically correct.

A few remarks of minor significance. On p. 866 the abbreviation נָזֵן is translated, "May his God and Redeemer protect him," whilst on p. 604 the same abbreviation is more correctly rendered, "May his Creator preserve and protect him." The full sentence is יִשְׁמַרְתּוּ צְרוּ וַיְחִיּוּ אֶת and not עַתְּלָה וַיְאִלּוּ. The words of an epigraph are, on p. 879, incorrectly translated as follows: "That it is time to work for the Lord *and for His word* which is the light of mine eyes." It would be more correct to say "And His words light up his eyes." וַיְדַבֵּר is not dependent on עַתְּלָה and אֶת is a verb and not a noun.

The third edition of the whole Bible was finished, according to the epigraph: וְשָׁלֵם נָלָה מְלָאכָה פָּרָ וַיְמַלֵּא כְּבוֹד ה' אֶת כָּל הָאָרֶץ. Dr. Ginsburg translated this, p. 879, "Thus the whole work was completed, and let the glory of the Lord fill the whole universe, in the year 254 (=A.D. 1494) here at Brescia." He has failed to see that פָּרָ וַיְמַלֵּא refers to the week's portion לְלִפְנֵי where the verse quoted, Num. xiv. 21, occurs.

In the edition of Psalms, Proverbs, Job, and Daniel, dated 1515, it is stated that the last book has seventy Sedarim סדרים 'y.

It is correctly remarked (p. 891) that this is a mistake, for this book only has seven divisions. Undoubtedly the printer read שְׁבָעִים instead of שְׁבָעָה and then printed an y. In the epigraph of the same edition it is stated that it was finished on the 4th of Ellul לְצִירָה מִשְׁנָה הַעֲדָה, which Dr. Ginsburg, p. 894, translates: In the year 280 of creation. This should be corrected into 275, for ה means 5,000.

והוא ברחמי יסעדני לחתihil וכו', which is translated "and, &c., he helped me to begin, &c.," whilst correctly it should be: "He will help me." The reference is not to past but to future action.

On p. 934, l. 14, *Amsterdam* is a misprint for *Antwerp* (= אנטוּרְפַּיָּה).

Incorrect is the translation of the words הַנִּמְצָא חַי הַמְדֵבֶר, p. 934, l. 22.

In the October number, 1897, of this REVIEW (X, 175 f.) I expressed the view that the Pope was the father of Jewish literary approbations, which derive their character from his authorization of the edition of the Vulgate published in 1592.

In T. B. de Rossi's *Annales Hebraeo-typographici* I found no reference to an approbation. I rejoice now to read in the work under notice, p. 936, that already in 1515 the Pope issued an authorization of the first edition of the Rabbinical Bible (Venice, 1515) on which Felix Pratensis worked, and in which the Christian world was highly interested. It already contains the characteristic features of most rabbinical approbations and reads as follows: "Ne quis hosce libros cum targum; vel absque targum; Bibliaeque expositores hebreos; ad decennium A. M. D. XV imprimat; vel impimentdos curet; Leo X Pont. Max. sub excommunicationis; et in terris Sanctae Roma Ecclesiae librorum quoque amissionis poena; cavit."

In reference to the history of the rabbinical approbation I find in B. Zuckermann's *Katalog der Seminar-Bibliothek*, First Part, Preface, MSS., Printed Works, Bible (Breslau, 1870, in the annual report of the Jewish Theological Seminary in Breslau), the following statements: "Rabbinical Approbations of literary works הַסְכָּמוֹת, which have come into fashion since the seventeenth century, are a fruitful source for the study of Jewish History. I therefore add to the description of every work which contains approbations, the names of their writers, as well as the places and dates where they were issued" (n. IX).

Zuckermann has also drawn up for his own use an alphabetical list of the names of all those who have issued approbations. Its publication would supply the want of an Index Approbationum. The epigraphs published by Dr. Ginsburg confirm Zunz's assertion, which was based on the MSS., "that the rhyming formula accompanying signatures יק לא הספר חוך נתחו, as well as the figure of a donkey climbing the ladder, belong to the third part of the thirteenth century" (*Gesammelte Schriften*, III, 78).

This he uses to determine the age of the Cassel Biblical MSS., Kennicott 157 (the references for this formula are: Introduction, p. 617, n. 1; 619, n. 2; 624, n. 2; 759, n. 1).

With this as a starting-point, we cannot agree with Dr. Ginsburg's date 1200 (p. 605) as the period of the undated Codex Brit. Mus. Add. 15751 (in G., No. 25), for this MS. has the mark above mentioned (p. 614, n. 4). The same is found in Brit. Mus. Add. 9399 (in G., No. 12, p. 534, n. 1 and 2).

We cannot accordingly accept here the date 1250 to 1300.

We now note the printer's errors which have come under our notice and which we have corrected as follows:

P. 3, note 1, (?) התכת הכתובים החלפו, 156, n. 2, ועתיקותם: והעתיקם, 179, n. 2; נתנו: נתין אותו, 197, n. 2, הטוב: חטו, 241, n. 1, Eben Saphir Lyck, 1866; 243, l. 5 in the note, נרו: נרו; 251, n. 2, Lickute Kadmoniot, Vienna, 1880: 1860; 306, n. 2, ובקמה: ובקמה; שכתו: שכתו, 325, l. 17, ib.; שחריבו: שחריבו, 327, n. 1 and 2 three times, 336, n. 1, 341, n. 2, *Sanhedrin*, 10, 3 b: 103 b; 377, ib., דאר"י בן לוי: דאר" בון לוי; דאר"י: דאר"י, 2, n. 2, במשכין: במשכין; היה: היה; כתוב: כתוב; כחוב: כחוב; 409, n. 2, 432, n. 1, 484, n. 2, 967: 976 (= as the date of the year); 543, n. 2, מאות וינשׁם כת' אלף ושבע מאות, then the date is 1007 as Dr. Ginsburg gives it in the text, and which agrees with 1387 Aera Contractuum and 4836 A. M.; 562, n. 20,

מִטְלָטָלָה : מִטְלָטָלָה, 1, 564, n. 5; בַּצְעֵן : בַּצְעֵן, 1, 597, n. 1; בַּצְעֵן : בַּצְעֵן ; דָּעֵב : דָּעֵב (Toledo); 606, n. 3; כִּי תָבָא : כִּי תָבָא (= 1395, as correctly in the text); 624, third line from end, surely a printer's error and not deviating orthography of אֲחַשְׁרָפָנִי, Esther iii. 12 and viii. 9, surely אֲחַשְׁרָפָנִי as Dr. Ginsburg does not mention such a word in the Hebrew Bible; 702, n. 2, עַל מָה : עַל מָה ; ib., l. 2, Jehuda Ibn Balsam : Balaam; 805, l. 6, the note וּמְהֻתּוֹרָה : the whole phrase is a little difficult, but probably should be read וּמְהֻתּוֹרָה, and dittographic of the preceding לְעַנֵּין בּוֹ הַשְׁעִיר ; ib., l. 10, לְבּ עֲרִים ; ib., l. 13, בּוֹה : בּוֹה ; ib., l. 13, לְעַיִן המְסִיק : המְסִיק להבנת זה n. 6, אַחֲר : אַחֲר ; קְהֻלָּה : קְהֻלָּה (Koheleth); 846, n. 19 and 20, אַחֲר ; 886, n. 1, וּוֹדִיה : וּוֹדִיה (or is this a printer's error already to be found in this edition of the Later Prophets?); 955, n. 13, Gen. iv. 18 : iv. 8; 964, ll. 2 and 4 from the end, נְסִיך : נְסִיך ; 970, n. 1, בְּחַשְׁׁ' ; 970, n. 18, Neh. viii. 68 : vii. 68. In Appendix II we also find printer's or author's errors, e.g. § 2 (p. 983), מְדוֹרִים מִמֶּה הַוִּרְיוֹה : מְדוֹרִים מִמֶּה הַוִּרְיוֹה. However, I will omit further discussion of these, as this critical notice has already gone to too great length, though I have left untouched many points on which the author and I disagree.

In conclusion, I must say that while, on the one hand, the prolixity and the looseness with which Dr. Ginsburg has treated the problems in question are not to my taste, while the needless repetitions are tiring, and his silence concerning fellow-workers in the same field, as well as the institution of original investigations instead of the utilization of results already existing, are to be deprecated, still I cannot, on the other hand, refuse to acknowledge the author's high merit in having described sixty most important MSS. and given us their rich results. His account of the origin and development of the Massora and of the more ancient printed editions of the Bible I most fully appreciate.

His *Introduction*, as well as his beautifully printed

Hebrew Bible, must be pronounced achievements of value.

The industry, extending over decades, and the untiring zeal which Christian D. Ginsburg has devoted to the unploughed field of the Massora, not only deserve appreciation but most genuine admiration.

LUDWIG BLAU.

BUDAPEST.